

Appl. No. 10/056,300
Reply to Office Action of August 9th, 2005

REMARKS:

Applicant appreciates the thorough examination of the application that is reflected in the Office Action dated August 9, 2005. Applicant thanks the Examiner for withdrawing the rejection of claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. 101 and under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) based on the Goldman reference. To expedite prosecution of this application, Applicant amends independent claims 1 and 10. Applicant cancels claims 11 and 12 without prejudice. Claims 1, 2-10 and 13 -18 are pending in the application. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, as amended, are respectfully requested.

Art-based Rejections

The Official Action rejects claims 1-4 and 6-18 under 35 U.S.C. 102 (e) as being anticipated by Chau et al. (US 2002/0123993) (hereinafter the "Chau reference").

Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1

Claim 1 relates to a computer-based method for extracting specific content from a document comprising content. Claim 1 requires the steps of:

creating a set of selection envelopes, wherein each selection envelope is associated with at least one selection command for locating a particular portion of said content within said document, wherein each selection command is a function configured to locate the particular portion of said content to be enclosed by a corresponding selection envelope, wherein each successive selection command narrows said content to be enclosed by a corresponding selection envelope corresponding to the selection command,

applying each selection command and its corresponding selection envelope to said content until said specific content from said document is enclosed in a particular one of the selection envelopes. (Emphasis added.)

The Chau reference relates to a technique for generating one or more XML documents from a single SQL query. Specifically, as discussed in the Abstract of the Chau reference, data stored on a data storage device is transformed. A query that selects data in the data storage device is received. The selected data is retrieved into a work space. Then, one or more XML documents are generated to consist of the selected data.

The Chau reference also relates to a technique for generating one or more XML documents from a relational database using the XPath data model. According to this technique,

Appl. No. 10/056,300

Reply to Office Action of August 9th, 2005

data stored on a data storage device is transformed. Initially, a document object model tree is generated using a document access definition, which defines the mapping between an XML tree structure and relational tables. The document object model tree is traversed to obtain information to retrieve relational data. The relational data is mapped to one or more XML documents. (Abstract of the Chau reference; emphasis added.)

In rejecting claim 1, the Office Action cites page 16, paragraphs [0357] through [0360] of the Chau reference. Page 16, paragraphs [0357] through [0360] of the Chau reference discusses that:

"[0357] In the DAD, a user can specify whether the location path will have multiple occurrence. In the above DAD example, the "/Order/Part/price" has multiple occurrence, and the side table price_tab was created for it. It is possible to have multiple rows in the part_tab table containing the same invoice_number. Therefore, a user should only select the distinct values. The following provides an example of how to do query for this case:

[0358] SELECT sales_person from sales_tab

[0359] WHERE invoice_number in

[0360] (SELECT DISTINCT invoice_number from price_tab WHERE price>2500.00)." (Chau at page 16, paragraphs [0357] through [0360]; emphasis added.)

Applicant submits that the Chau reference fails to teach the concept of a "creating a set of selection envelopes, wherein each selection envelope is associated with at least one selection command for locating a particular portion of said content within said document, wherein each selection command is a function configured to locate the particular portion of said content to be enclosed by a corresponding selection envelope, wherein each successive selection command narrows said content to be enclosed by a corresponding selection envelope corresponding to the selection command," as required by claim 1.

Applicant respectfully reminds the Examiner, that "[w]here an explicit definition is provided by the applicant for a term, that definition will control interpretation of the term as it is used in the claim. *Toro Co. v. White Consolidated Industries Inc.*, 199 F.3d 1295, 1301, 53 USPQ2d 1065, 1069 (Fed. Cir. 1999) (meaning of words used in a claim is not construed in a

Appl. No. 10/056,300
Reply to Office Action of August 9th, 2005

"lexicographic vacuum, but in the context of the specification and drawings")." See MPEP § 2173.05(a). The "GLOSSARY OF TERMS," at page 4, lines 20-21 of the present application, defines a selection envelope as "A function of a set of domain-specific selection commands. The application of a selection envelope on a source document selects the desired data element(s)." (Emphasis added.) Page 4, lines 17-19 of the present application defines a selection command as "A function used to locate a specific piece of content within a document. If the content is located, begin and end markers may be placed adjacent to the content."

The Chau reference simply discloses a query that allows a user to search a location path in an XML document having an attribute which refers to multiple values. This query allows the user to only select the distinct values.

Applicant notes that amended claim 1 requires that each *selection envelope* is associated with at least one selection command ... for locating said specific a particular portion of said content within said document, and further that each selection command is *a function configured to locate the particular portion of said content to be enclosed* by a corresponding selection envelope. Applicant submits that the Chau reference does not teach the concept of "*creating a set of selection envelopes*," as required by claim 1. Notably, the query disclosed in the Chau reference is not a "function of a set of domain-specific selection commands," as described at page 4, lines 20-21 of the present application. Moreover, Applicant submits that the Chau reference does not teach that *each successive selection command narrows said content to be enclosed by a corresponding selection envelope* corresponding to the selection command, or "*applying each selection command* and its corresponding selection envelope to said content *until said specific content from said source document is enclosed* in a particular one of the selection envelopes," as recited in amended claim 1.

As such, Applicant submits that the Chau reference fails to teach the concept of a "*creating a set of selection envelopes*, wherein each selection envelope is associated with at least one selection command for locating a particular portion of said content within said document, wherein each selection command is a function configured to locate the particular portion of said content to be enclosed by a corresponding selection envelope, wherein each successive selection command narrows said content to be enclosed by a corresponding selection envelope corresponding to the selection command," or "applying each selection command and

Appl. No. 10/056,300

Reply to Office Action of August 9th, 2005

its corresponding selection envelope to said content until said specific content from said document is enclosed in a particular one of the selection envelopes," as required by claim 1.

Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that claim 1, and its dependent claims 2-4 and 6-9, are patentable over the Chau reference. In addition, Applicant submits that many of the dependent claims are separately patentable since the Chau reference fails to teach recitations present in those claims.

Claim 5

The Official Action rejects claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chau et al. in view of Copperman et al. (USPN 6,711,585).

Applicant submits that the Copperman reference fails teach or suggest at least the above-noted limitations which are missing from the Chau reference. Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that dependent claim 5 is patentable over the Chau reference in view of Copperman reference.

Appl. No. 10/056,300
Reply to Office Action of August 9th, 2005

Claim 10

Claim 10 relates to a computer-based method for extracting desired content from a content source. Claim 10 requires the steps of:

parameterizing a plurality of selection commands to operate on said source, wherein each selection command is a function configured to locate a particular portion of said content source to be enclosed by a corresponding selection envelope, wherein each successive selection command narrows the particular portion of said content source to be enclosed by the selection envelope corresponding to the selection command;
defining a parent selection envelope corresponding to a first selection command for locating a first content within said content source;
using the first selection command associated with the parent selection envelope to select first content from said content source;
determining whether said first content is said desired content; and
extracting said first content if said first content is said desired content;
defining a child selection envelope corresponding to a second selection command for locating second content within said content source if said first content is not said desired content;
using the second selection command associated with said child selection envelope to select the second content from said content source;
determining whether the second content is said desired content; and
extracting the second content if the second content is said desired content.

(Emphasis added.)

For at least the reasons noted above, the Chau reference fails to teach, for example, the concepts of a “defining a parent selection envelope corresponding to a particular one of the selection commands for locating a first content within said content source,” or “defining a child selection envelope corresponding to a second selection command for locating second content within said content source if said first content is not said desired content,” as required by claim 10.

Moreover, Applicant submits that the cited Chau reference fails to teach or suggest, for example, “parameterizing a plurality of selection commands to operate on said source, wherein each selection command is a function configured to locate a particular portion of said content source to be enclosed by a corresponding selection envelope, wherein each successive selection command narrows the particular portion of said content source to be enclosed by the selection envelope corresponding to the selection command,” as required by claim 10.

Appl. No. 10/056,300
Reply to Office Action of August 9th, 2005

In rejecting claim 10, the Office Action cites column 11:25-30 of the Chau reference as allegedly teaching this step. However, column 11:25-30 of the Chau reference merely discusses that:

“The selection criteria attribute can comprise a single statement, or one or more statements joined by a Boolean word (i.e., AND, OR, XOR, etc.). A value-defined container definition node also comprises a pointer 908 to a list 910 of one or more child value-defined container definition nodes (not shown).” (Chau at column 11:25-30; emphasis added.)

Thus, while the Chau reference describes the concept of a “selection criteria attribute” and a “value-defined container definition node,” the Chau reference fails to teach the concept of a “selection command” as required by claim 10. Nothing in the Chau reference suggests that the “selection criteria attribute” or the “value-defined container definition node,” is used to “locate a particular portion of said content content to be enclosed by a corresponding selection envelope.”

Thus, Applicant submits that the Chau reference fails to teach, for example, “parameterizing a plurality of selection commands to operate on said source, wherein each selection command is a function configured to locate the particular portion of said content to be enclosed by a corresponding selection envelope, wherein each successive selection command narrows said content to be enclosed by the selection envelope corresponding to the selection command,” as required by claim 10.

Finally, Applicant submits that the Chau reference also fails to teach, for example, “defining a child selection envelope corresponding to a second selection command for locating second content within said content source if said first content is not said desired content; using the second selection command associated with said child selection envelope to select the second content from said content source; determining whether the second content is said desired content; and extracting the second content if the second content is said desired content,” as required by claim 10.

Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that claim 10, and its dependent claims 13-18, are patentable over the Chau reference. In addition, Applicant submits

Appl. No. 10/056,300
Reply to Office Action of August 9th, 2005

that many of the dependent claims are separately patentable since the Chau reference fails to teach recitations present in those claims.

Appl. No. 10/056,300
Reply to Office Action of August 9th, 2005

For at least the reasons noted above, Applicant submits that all of the pending claims are allowable and such allowance is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any questions or wish to further discuss this application, Applicant requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney at (480) 385-5060.

If for some reason Applicant has not requested a sufficient extension and/or has not paid a sufficient fee for this response and/or for the extension necessary to prevent abandonment on this application, please consider this as a request for an extension for the required time period and/or authorization to charge Deposit Account No. 50-2091 for any fee which may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

INGRASSIA FISHER & LORENZ

Dated: November 9th, 2005

By: Erin P. Madill
Erin P. Madill
Reg. No. 46,893
(480) 385-5060